

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated November 12, 2009 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, 13 and 14 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-10 and 13-14 are rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0063732 by Mansikkaniemi et al. (hereinafter “Mansikkaniemi”).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as previously presented are not anticipated by Mansikkaniemi. However, in order to facilitate prosecution of the application and in a *bona fide* attempt to advance the application to allowance, the Applicants present this response with amendment to clarify particular aspects of the claimed invention.

For example, Claim 1 now recites facilitating user entry of one or more calendar entries into a terminal. The entries each include a time of an event and a user-composed calendar note describing the event. A text pattern is detected in the one or more calendar notes, and the one or more calendar notes are associated with one or more calendar profiles in a terminal on the basis of the detected text patterns. Each calendar profile defines a unique view to the calendar entries. Similar amendments have been made to Claims 5, 10, and 14. These amendments are fully supported in the Specification as filed (e.g., paragraphs 0021, 0026, 0034-0035) and no new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully submit that Mansikkaniemi fails to anticipate at least Claims 1, 5, 10, and 14. The Office Action cites Mansikkaniemi’s teaching of a new event being designated to either be listed on the family calendar or just on the individual’s calendar as teaching, e.g., the detecting of an identifier in calendar notes that is used to associate the notes with profiles. However, Mansikkaniemi does not provide any particular details of how this designation is made.

The present claims are directed to a particular way of determining a profile, that being the detection of a text pattern in a user-composed calendar note. Because Mansikkaniemi does not expressly or inherently teach at least this type of detection, Mansikkaniemi does not anticipate independent Claims 1, 5, 10, and 14. Claims 4, 8, 9, and 13 depend respectively

from Claims 1, 5, and 10. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from Mansikkaniemi. Therefore, dependent Claims 4, 8, 9, and 13 are also allowable over Mansikkaniemi.

Finally, Applicants note the addition of Claims 18-25. These claims are fully supported by the Specification as filed (e.g., paragraphs 0035-0038), and no new matter has been added. These claims are allowable over the Mansikkaniemi reference at least because of their respective dependence from Claims 1 and 10. Entry and allowance of Claims 18-25 is therefore respectfully solicited.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (IHN.080.WUS) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8500 Normandale Lake Blvd., Suite 320
Minneapolis, MN 55437
952.854.2700

Date: February 10, 2010

By: /William B. Ashley/

William B. Ashley
Reg. No. 51,419